

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	4740	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	Amador County Water Agency	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$145,500
PROJECT TITLE	Amador/Mokelumne Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$194,000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Focus on four main water management objectives: water supply, water quality, groundwater management, and ecosystem restoration. Utilize local planning documents and projects as the basis of the regional analysis and strategy development.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 15

Comment: The work plan is clear and implementable, and incorporates tasks necessary to complete the IRWMP in a logical order. The flow seems complete and simple. The budget appears to be reasonable, and is detailed with respect to hours needed to complete tasks and subtasks. Billable rates for various staff are provided, with the bulk of the work going to project engineers and planners. A 25% match is included. The schedule for completion of the IRWMP begins on January 2, 2006, and is anticipated to continue until October 6, 2006, when the IRWMP is scheduled for adoption. The work plan documents the proposal in a clear manner and seems feasible for an initial planning process.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: The region is well defined and seems to be appropriate for management. The applicant provides general descriptions and excellent maps showing resources and infrastructure and provides a good general discussion of environmental resources and sensitive habitat, social and cultural makeup, and economic trends of its people. This proposal identifies the advantages of regional planning.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The applicant acknowledges that the list of objectives is preliminary and will be adjusted and updated as members are confirmed through an MOU. The applicant does indicate that IRWMP objectives should be applied for at least a 20-year planning horizon, and public meetings will be held to establish a framework for receiving ideas and concerns related to the IRWMP. The applicant does not provide specific objectives, but does indicate that potential criteria for projects are 1) application of multiple water management strategies; and 2) the ability of a project to provide multiple benefits to the region if implemented. Statewide priorities as defined on page 5 of the Guidelines have not been considered or addressed.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: The applicant states that the IRWMP will be built around the goals and objectives of the State's IRWM program, and will address regional conflicts and problems associated with water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality through implementation of multiple water management strategies. The applicant does demonstrate an understanding of water management integration and will promote those projects that best make use of multiple water management strategies. Table 1-6 of the application provides nine examples of potential projects, consistent with the goals of the IRWMP, and the water management strategies that each would employ. However, the applicant could have explained how these strategies will result in meeting regional and statewide planning objectives and how the strategies will be implemented.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The proposal includes criteria by which projects will be included and prioritized in the IRWMP. However, there is no discussion about monitoring the performance of the IRWMP or the individual projects. No detailed schedule is presented, but the applicant states that when projects have been defined and prioritized, a schedule will be prepared. The structure and process for ensuring implementation of the IRWMP has not been developed.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: The impacts and benefits are described in general, however, no specifics are provided. In anticipation of the need to identify impacts and benefits, the applicant proposes three well thought out possibilities that would need to be considered when analyzing the potential effects of the IRWMP components. The applicant expects that local impacts and benefits would be identified during the data and project collection tasks, and regional considerations would be made during preparation of the IRWMP. The applicant states that analysis under CEQA would be employed when necessary, and will likely be initiated as a bridge between planning and implementation phases. The applicant also states that the IRWMP will be analyzed for environmental impacts according to CEQA guidelines, even if the IRWMP does not require CEQA analysis.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant states there is already enough technical and planning data available to support the development of the IRWMP, but no specific examples are presented. The applicant indicates that more analysis will be performed to support the conclusions and recommendations of the IRWMP. A data survey is proposed as part of the IRWMP, and a data gap review will be completed where necessary, filling gaps of information that are critical to Plan formation. Existing planning documents are stated as one of the primary sources of IRWMP data, as well as technical data from already conceived projects; however, no examples of those documents are provided, only references to water quantity and quality data. The applicant could have provided numerous details regarding the quality of the data available for already conceived projects, which would have better described the region and the objectives.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant states that data will be integrated into State Water Board data management efforts. However, there is no specific method identified that would disseminate the data to stakeholders, agencies or the public. The process for gathering and managing the data is not addressed. The proposal does not include a process for gathering and managing data from development and implementation to dissemination. More detail is needed.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The applicant identifies nine regional partners and acknowledges that additional stakeholders will play an integral part of the development of the IRWMP. Strategies to involve stakeholders are described and a preliminary list of 27 potential stakeholders, which appears to be comprehensive, is provided. The proposal identifies opportunities to bring stakeholders into the program, such as a public kick-off meeting and communication opportunities. An IRWMP website is proposed to keep stakeholders informed of new information and information will also be placed in local newspapers. The proposal does mention environmental justice but indicates that it, and unfair exclusion of groups, will not be an issue. However, there is no indication of what the decision making process is, or how they would include outreach to stakeholders. In addition, it is not clear which agency/entity is the lead.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: Two DACs (the cities of Jackson and Plymouth) are identified. These communities are partners in the IRWMP. Two of the projects listed are the Jackson Wastewater Discharge and the Plymouth Water Supply Project. These projects assist DACs. However, the applicant does not directly describe the benefits to DACs.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: According to the applicant, existing planning documents will be one of the primary resources for the development of the IRWMP. The IRWMP will be the "umbrella" document and will need to be in compliance with the local policies and not contradict any of the local guidelines. Future revisions of existing planning documents, and generation of new documents, will be expected to rely upon the IRWMP for guidance and compliance with water management issues. However, how the local planning documents will be incorporated into the regional planning effort is not clear.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: This proposal states local, State, and federal agencies will be involved in all stages of planning and implementation. Agency representatives will be invited to all public meetings and appropriate internal meetings to provide advice and direction, and City and County planning departments will all be identified as stakeholders, if not partners, in the IRWMP. State regulatory agencies are identified and coordination strategy described. Local agency partners and cooperators are identified; and reference is made to coordination with local land-use planning decision-makers [occurring] in much the same way as with the other agencies. Yet little detail is given beyond general concepts of coordination and cooperation.

TOTAL SCORE: 70